



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/622,904	10/23/2000	Jae-Yeon Ahn	P19945	5016

7055 7590 02/19/2004

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, DEBORAH D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

PCT

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/622,904

Applicant(s)

AHN, JAE-YEON

Examiner

Suzanne Dino Barrett

Art Unit

3676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 16
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 10/28/03. These drawings are approved.

Specification

2. It is noted that the request for a Substitute Specification has been withdrawn.
See Interview Summary of paper no. 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,2,5,8,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Reeve 4,561,544 or Ikebe et al 5,385,235. Reeve teaches a container comprising a holder 12 having a leaf spring means 28 and hanger protrusion 31 for engaging a sidewall through hole 16 of a case body 11 and further providing a dovetail engagement means 18,19 between the holder and case body. Ikebe et al teach a storage container for disks comprising a case body 2 and holder 1 having leaf spring means 9 and a hanger protrusion 4 to engage through holes in a sidewall of the case 2. It would have

Art Unit: 3676

been considered an obvious reversal of parts to provide the hanger protrusion on the lock groove, and the through hole on the leaf spring, of both Reeve and Ikebe et al.

5. Claims 6,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Lax 5,988,376. Lax teaches a key block 70 having magnets 78 therein to unlock the locking protrusions 62 and further providing a stepped groove portion in the key block for supporting the case body 32 and pin member 80 therefor.

6. Claims 3,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Reeve or Ikebe et al in view of Komatsu et al 5,680,782. Komatsu et al teach a storage container having hanger protrusions in the form of a right triangle (ends of 203,204). It would have been an obvious modification to change the shape of the hangers of either Reeve or Ikebe et al to a right triangle as taught by Komatsu et al to provide a more secure engagement between the surfaces.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 11-14 are allowed.

The prior art of record fails to teach the guide rails on both sides having leaf spring biased hanger protrusions and a key block having a supporting pin and magnets which unlock the protrusions.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8,10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In response to Applicant's amendments, the claims are still rejected over the previously applied Reeve and Ikebe references, all under 35 USC 103. Since applicant amended claim 1 to now recite that the leaf spring mounted to the rail groove has a through hole to receive the hanger protrusion, the rejection is based under 35 USC 103 as an obvious reversal of parts since no criticality is shown as to the placement of the hanger protrusion on the leaf spring or the lock groove and they appear to be interchangeable in view of the prior art of record. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 10 stand rejected. Furthermore, the certified copies of the Priority Document have still not been received.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any


Art Unit: 3676

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne Dino Barrett whose telephone number is 703-308-0825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 703-308-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1020.


Suzanne Dino Barrett
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3676

sdb